



---

## 2008 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

12-17-2008

# USA v. Charles McCormick

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2008](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008)

---

### Recommended Citation

"USA v. Charles McCormick" (2008). *2008 Decisions*. 84.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2008/84](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008/84)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2008 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

**NOT PRECEDENTIAL**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 07-4776

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CHARLES MCCORMICK,  
Appellant

---

Appeal from the  
United States District Court for the  
District of New Jersey  
(D.C. Criminal No. 07-cr-00075)  
District Judge: Honorable Robert B. Kugler

---

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)  
November 21, 2008

---

Before: BARRY and CHAGARES, Circuit Judges, and RESTANI\*, Judge

Opinion Filed: December 17, 2008

---

OPINION

---

RESTANI, Judge.

---

\* Honorable Jane A. Restani, Chief Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, sitting by designation.

In this appeal, Charles McCormick challenges his sentence of 33 months for a three-count wire fraud conviction as unreasonable. We will affirm the sentence.

The facts of the underlying crime are well-known to the parties and we will not repeat them here. The sentence is within the range calculated under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines and that calculation is not challenged. McCormick also concedes that the court identified mitigating facts as it recounted the factors it was required to consider under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). McCormick's argument, rather, is that that consideration was formulaic and that the court placed undo emphasis on his criminal history and the seriousness of the offense.

Where the court has so clearly considered the statutory factors and cited to the specific evidence of record for potential mitigation, it is difficult to conclude the court did not follow proper procedure. That the court was moved by prior criminal history and the seriousness of the offense, nonetheless, to select a sentence at the high end of the guideline range does not establish an abuse of discretion. We conclude that the sentence was a reasonable one and will affirm the District Court's Judgment and Conviction Order.